

**FACTORS LEADING TO BETTER JOB SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE IN
THE EMS DIVISION OF THE CONTRA COSTA COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION
DISTRICT**

EXECUTIVE PLANNING

BY: Stephen Maiero
Contra Costa County Fire Protection District
Pleasant Hill, California

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy
as part of the Executive Fire Officer Program

June 2002

Appendices Not Included. Please visit the Learning Resource Center on the Web at <http://www.lrc.dhs.gov/> to learn how to obtain this report in its entirety through Interlibrary Loan.

ABSTRACT

The problem identified was an absence of information regarding which factors were important to improving job performance and employee satisfaction as part of a systems approach to the Continuous Quality Improvement process in the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Division. The purpose of this applied research paper was to determine the level of employee satisfaction with the EMS Division; to identify strategies to promote or enhance job satisfaction; and to determine how well the EMS management was doing in providing internal customer service.

Prior to the development of any action plans, it was necessary to determine the attitudes and opinions of the EMTs and paramedics regarding the factors that lead to job satisfaction. Descriptive research was used to describe how the employees viewed the factors associated with improved performance and job satisfaction.

In concluding this project, the following research questions were asked. First, what things are important to the employee that allows them to do a good job in providing EMS care? Second, what are the important things that an employee requires for job satisfaction as it relates to EMS? Lastly, how well is the EMS leadership doing at providing an environment to promote enhance job satisfaction?

To accomplish this project, the entire suppression workforce was queried using three feedback instruments to gather the necessary. First, an employee survey was used to gather general feedback. That was followed by an employee ballot that asked the workforce to rank the information received from the survey. Lastly, based on the

ballot results, the employees evaluated the EMS Division's performance in the areas of supporting teamwork, management and leadership, and training and supplies.

The results received provided a detailed picture of the attitudes and opinions of the workforce related to EMS activities. The amount of questionnaires returned was sufficient to be statistically relevant. Overall, the workforce provided ample information that reflected a consistently average rating in most of the categories queried.

The recommendations developed from this project were divided up into general process areas and specific action items. From a process point of view it was recommended to report the findings of the project back to the workforce, develop an action and implementation plan to systematically analyze and address the problem areas and to conduct a second survey in two years to determine if any of the problem areas showed improvement. From a specific action point of view, it was recommended to develop some direction for improvement in the area of supporting teamwork, providing more effective communications and recognizing employee effort. From a general point of view, it was recommended to develop a plan that would provide the means to shift the bell curves identified in Appendix F to the right within two years. This would be reflective of a more positive and rewarding environment in which employees would be more productive and more satisfied with the organization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the work of Contra Costa County's Quality Improvement Coordinator, Carol Gallagher, RN, BSN, MPA, whose assistance made this applied research paper possible. Ms. Gallagher's guidance and direction in the development and statistical analysis of the internal job satisfaction survey was invaluable to this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....4

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....5

INTRODUCTION.....6

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE.....7

LITERATURE REVIEW.....9

PROCEDURES.....13

RESULTS.....17

DISCUSSION.....19

RECOMMENDATIONS.....23

REFERENCES.....26

APPENDIX A (Action Plan – EMS Customer Satisfaction).....27

APPENDIX B (Employee Survey)28

APPENDIX C (Employee Ballot).....29

APPENDIX D (Employee Ballot Results).....30

APPENDIX E (Employee Evaluation of EMS).....31

APPENDIX F (Employee Evaluation Results).....32

INTRODUCTION

At the foundation of any successful business is quality customer service. This research paper focuses on the internal customer, our employees, using the premise that satisfied employees are more likely to be more productive and to yield more satisfied customers. Accordingly the implementation of a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Program that measures the quality of system and individual performance must include a process for determining the needs of the employee in successfully meeting the mission of the organization. The CQI program is dependent on data for success. A key factor is the need to know how employees feel about their work, environment and leadership. Culturally, the Fire District has never formally surveyed their employees. The Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Division of the Contra Costa County Fire District recognized the need to measure how well it is providing the direction, resources and leadership necessary for a successful program.

The problem identified is an absence of data and information regarding the factors that are important to improving job performance and employee satisfaction as part of a systems approach to the Continuous Quality Improvement process in the EMS Division. The purpose of this applied research paper is to determine the level of employee satisfaction with the EMS Division; to identify strategies to promote or enhance job satisfaction; and to determine how well the EMS management was doing in providing internal customer service.

Prior to the development of any action plans, it's necessary to determine the current attitudes and opinions of the EMTs and paramedics regarding the factors

leading to job satisfaction. Descriptive research will be used to describe how the employees view the factors associated with improved performance and job satisfaction.

To conclude this project, the following research questions must be asked.

Research Question 1: “What things are important to the employee that allows them to do a good job in providing EMS care?”

Research Question 2: “What are the important things that an employee requires for job satisfaction as it relates to EMS?”

Research Question 3: “How well is the EMS leadership doing at providing an environment to promote and enhance job satisfaction?”

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The Contra Costa County Fire District is a metropolitan sized fire department that staffs 30 engine companies covering an area over 366 square miles. The District employs over 400 personnel in three major sections, Operations, Support Services and Administration. An Assistant Chief, EMS Chief, Training Chief and 11 Battalion Chiefs, covering four battalions, manage the Operations Section.

In 1997, the District created the EMS Chief position to expand EMS services to include advanced life support capabilities on all engine companies. California regulation requires any provider of advanced life support services to have a written quality improvement program that is approved by the local EMS regulatory authority. In 2001, the District's quality improvement program was staffed with a full time nurse educator whose role is to meet the established goals of the program. One of those goals is to look for ways to address and improve EMS performance at a system level.

The EMS Division's expansion into advanced life support services includes functional supervision of the paramedics as well as responsibility for initial and continuing educations of all line personnel who are either paramedic or EMT-Defibrillation certified. Although the Training Division has a centralized training facility through which all personnel attend various training on a monthly basis, maintaining effective communications with field personnel and measuring system performance has been challenging at best.

There has been ample literature over the years that links employee job satisfaction with improved performance. The Fire District has never formally measured this factor. While many public safety organizations have undertaken efforts to recognize the importance of the external customer, the internal customers often get overlooked. Probationary reports, annual evaluations, and retrospective audits from patient care reports are often the only methods used to measure performance.

In order to obtain valid information regarding identifying methods for system improvement, it was felt that all suppression personnel should be surveyed. Therefore, as part of the quality improvement plan, the EMS Division developed an objective to determine the level of employee satisfaction within the Fire District's EMS Division. Based on the results, the EMS Division would identify what actions would be helpful in improving performance and job satisfaction. Then, an action plan could be developed to implement changes and measure employee job satisfaction.

This research problem has relevance to several course areas of the Executive Planning Course at the National Fire Academy. Specifically, there is linkage to the

chapters on strategic planning, project management, leadership and analysis. The information gleaned from this research will have application to all of the aforementioned management activities within the EMS Division of the Contra Costa County Fire District. Through the development of data leading to improved employee satisfaction and job performance, it is believed this research will aid in promoting all four of USFA operational objectives.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Much has been written in recent history about customer service, quality management and employee satisfaction. Yet, the first approach to measuring employee satisfaction and productivity goes back to prior to World War II. Hitt, Middlemist and Mathis (1989) identified one of the most well known studies on how the work environment affects employee productivity. First published in 1939, three researchers (F.J. Roethlisberger, William J. Dickson and Elton Mayo) conducted studies at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company. They believed that through the use of scientific management, workers exposed to a positive environment would be more efficient and less tired. What they found was not that the environment itself led to better work productivity, but the process of being studied led to increased productivity. This was the first study that concluded that non-economic factors affect employees' behavior at work. "As a result of the Hawthorne studies, a social view of employees evolved" (p. 49).

Today's modern literature has a wealth of information regarding the importance of customer service. Juran, Deming, Blanchard, Hersey, Senge, and other leadership

and quality management authors all identify the importance of customer satisfaction as an indicator of success. Yet, few of these authors specifically identify customer satisfaction as an outcome of employee satisfaction. Although this linkage is scant in the literature, there is considerable information regarding theories of motivation and the environment as it relates to measuring employee satisfaction and job performance.

Hunt (1992) describes the need for a quality first self-assessment. He identifies four areas to question in terms of quality enhancements. Those areas are climate, processes, management tools, and outcomes. The climate identifies people's perceptions about their organization or work unit. The processes review looks at the organization's or work unit's policies, practices, and procedures. The management tools area identifies the specific techniques used to promote quality improvements throughout the organization or work units. The outcomes area looks simply at mission accomplishment (p. 145-146).

The Malcolm Baldrige Criteria (1999) speaks to the importance of valuing employees. It states "an organization's success depends increasingly on the knowledge, skills, innovative creativity and motivation of its work force." It further expresses the importance of addressing employee challenges through the use of employee related data on knowledge skills, satisfaction, motivation, safety, and well-being. In other words, to get this information, you actually have to ask the employees how they feel. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (1998) quotes "Tom Peters, well known management guru, preaches that the best organizations are those

that seek input from employees and allow them to assist in the decision making process” (p. 23).

In a study of 140 Pittsburgh paramedics who were asked to develop a list of quality indicators, Greenburg (1997) reported that job satisfaction was included by paramedics at every focus group along with timeliness of care, patient satisfaction, and quality of education.

Another important area of consideration is the identification of those things that are necessary to achieve job satisfaction. Pace and Faules (1994) states “the concept that appears at the core of one’s workday is satisfaction with the organization; with an acceptable level of organizational satisfaction, employees tend to leave or at least to withdrawal from the organization” (p. 336). They further go on to state that motivation is not necessarily tied to job satisfaction, but more to job dissatisfaction. In other words, if the employee is satisfied, they are generally quiet. When they are dissatisfied, they are motivated to some form of action. This concept drives the need to empirically capture real data about the levels of job satisfaction in any organization as a function of quality performance.

This is similar to the work of Frederick Herzberg in 1959. Herzberg created the motivation-hygiene theory which “concluded that two groups of factors influence workers’ feelings about their jobs: motivators and hygienes. Achievement, recognition, responsibility, opportunity for advancement and the work itself are motivators. Hygienes include such items as company policy and administration, technical supervision, salary, working conditions, and interpersonal relations. Herzberg’s findings indicated that

satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not at opposite ends of the same continuum. The opposite of satisfaction is 'no satisfaction' and the opposite of dissatisfaction is 'no dissatisfaction' (Hitt, Middlemist and Mathis, 1989).

According to Bavendam (2000), employees with higher job satisfaction believe the organization will be satisfying in the long run, care about the quality of their work, are more committed to the organization, have higher retention rates, and are more productive. Their research carefully defines job satisfaction as people's affective response to their current job conditions. It is important to recognize the distinction between job satisfaction and its consequents. For example, the decision to stay with an organization is not a symptom of job satisfaction, but rather a consequence of job satisfaction. Their research also recognized that dissatisfaction was a greater motivator than satisfaction. People generally react more immediately to unpleasant situations than to pleasant ones.

Juran (1989), noted quality management guru, has developed the Juran trilogy for quality leadership. This trilogy focuses on the processes of quality planning, quality control and quality improvement. He devotes an entire chapter to the work force and quality. He establishes the importance of the contributions of the work force to managing for quality. Juran states "the overall relationship of the work force to quality goes beyond potential contributions and necessary infrastructure. It also includes the motivation to make contributions and the training required to be able to make the contributions" (p. 261).

Within the Contra Costa County Fire District's EMS Quality Improvement Program is a statement identifying the importance of the provision of feedback to all system participants about all of the process steps and the results obtained. One of the five major performance area indicators recognizes the criticality of customer service and satisfaction indicators (Gallagher, 2001).

Cannie (1991) believes "the key to designing a customer-driven service strategy is learning what you are and are not doing well that will drive or impede the service improvement process. It is necessary to determine what are the key causes of unmet customer needs and poor service quality" (p. 77). Cannie further goes on to identify the need to not only determine if people are doing the right things, but to determine if they are doing the right things right. "Often doing the right things right demands empowering your service delivery people to make a decision to scrap the process and take care of the customer" (p. 78).

PROCEDURES

Descriptive research was used to describe the attitudes and opinions of the fire suppression workforce in terms of what issues or factors are important to their job performance and satisfaction. All of the employees surveyed are trained to either the Emergency Medical Technician-Defibrillation (EMT-D) or Paramedic (EMT-P) levels. No sampling techniques were employed as all the current members of the fire suppression staff were queried.

A broad overview of the procedures used for data collection occurred in three phases. The Fire District's EMS Quality Improvement Coordinator developed a project

work plan (Appendix A). The data collection techniques used a series of employee surveys and ballot methods. The initial survey was conducted to determine what was important to the employees in assisting them to be able to do a good job in EMS and to enjoy job satisfaction. The survey instrument allowed for essay type responses to specific questions. Once the surveys were received, the entire list of responses were compiled in a second ballot survey that asked the same survey group to rate the responses in the order of importance. Once collected, the top vote getters were gathered in a third evaluation instrument that asked the same survey group how well the EMS division was performing in meeting the factors identified. This last instrument was broken down into three sectors, teamwork, leadership, and training/equipment. The results were tallied and are included within.

Phase I

In this phase, the objective was to gather some specific opinions and attitudes about what the workforce felt was important to help them perform better and what they needed to have better job satisfaction. In October 2001, the first survey was sent to all suppression employees (Appendix B). Respondents were asked to identify their level of training, EMT or Paramedic. This survey asked two questions. The first question asked was "What are the three most important things you need to do a good job in providing EMS care?" This could be a thing either currently in place or those they would like to see in the future. The respondent was given three open spaces to record their responses. The second questions asked was "What are three things that you require for job satisfaction as it relates to EMS?" Again, the respondent had three open spaces

to record their responses. Six weeks was allowed to return the survey. Once the results for the survey were received, they were compiled into a second balloting instrument to determine which of all the comments received were most important.

Phase II

In December 2001, the Employee Ballot (Appendix C) was sent to the same employees. This instrument asked the same questions as the original survey, but this time asked respondents to rate the listed factors in the order of importance, selecting only the top three priorities. The instrument directed employees to rate the three most important factors from all the factors received from the survey. A rating of 1= most important, 2= next most important, 3= 3rd most important. Employees were given one month to complete the ballot. Once received, the ballot results were compiled. Due to the survey ranking system, it was necessary to use a nominal ranking score that would show actual priorities. For example, the total scores would yield a higher value for the third most important factor than they would for the most important factor. Through the use of a P-factor conversion, it was possible to determine the top vote getters. (Appendix D). The results were screened for items outside the control of the EMS division. For example, wanting increased pay and benefits was outside the control of our leadership responsibility, therefore it was not used in the follow up evaluation. From the results of the employee balloting instrument, the EMS Division began to get a clearer picture as to what factors were important to the workforce in improving job performance and satisfaction.

Phase III

Once the employee ballot results were completed, the Fire District's Quality Leadership Council met to discuss the final evaluation regarding how well the EMS Division was performing. Ballot results that were outside the scope of responsibility of the EMS Division or that had already been accomplished were filtered out of the results. Based on the identified priorities, three categories were chosen to assess the success of the EMS Division in meeting the needs of the work force. Those categories are teamwork, management and leadership practices, and training and equipment. Within each of these categories, the Quality Leadership Council along with the Quality Improvement Coordinator developed 18 specific questions to focus the respondent on how well the management and leadership of the EMS Division was doing in meeting the stated categories relative to successful job performance and employee satisfaction. This evaluation instrument was released to the workforce in March 2002 (Appendix E). In each of the questions asked, employees would respond by rating the question from one through five, with "1" being very poor, "3" being average or "ok", and "5" being very good. Once the evaluation forms were received, the information was compiled by the EMS Quality Improvement Coordinator and a statistical and graph analysis was compiled to provide a visual tool for answering the last question of this research project, "How well is the EMS Division doing in providing internal customer service to our workforce?"

Limitations

The only limitation to this project was the exact number of survey instruments actually received by the employees is unknown due to vacations, sick leave and workers compensation absences.

Definition of Terms

Survey instrument – The first instrument used, it was designed to query attitudes and opinions regarding the questions posed.

Ballot instrument – The second instrument used, it was designed to rank the information gleaned from the survey instrument.

Evaluation instrument – The third instrument used, it was designed to evaluate the management staff using the ranked information from the ballot instrument.

Survey population – The survey population was all employees in the ranks of Firefighter, Firefighter-Paramedic, Engineer and Fire Captain. This number was 313 employees. The exact number received is unknown due to vacations and workers compensation scheduling.

RESULTS

All of the survey instruments were sent to 313 employees. All of the initial survey responses were compiled into the employee ballot. On the employee ballot, 90 of 313 ballots were received, representing a 28% return. Of the 90 ballots received, 10% were discarded as non-usable due to being incomplete, leaving a total usable number of 81 ballots. Of the 90 received, 83% were from EMTs, 12% were from paramedics, and 4% were unknown. This is reflective of the workforce composition which is currently 85%

EMTs and 15% paramedics. On the last evaluation instrument, 98 of 313 evaluations or 31% was received. Similarly, 81% were from EMTs, 15% were from paramedics and 4% were unknown.

The following represents the results of the employee survey and ballot instruments. It represents the results from Phase I and Phase II of the procedures.

Research Question 1: “What things are important to the employee that allows them to do a good job in providing EMS care?”

In the original survey instrument, the responses yielded a list of 18 factors that the employees felt were important to doing a good job in providing EMS care. Those factors can be found in Appendix C on the Employee Ballot. When asked to identify the three most important factors from the list developed, the results were ranked in priority order. The three most important factors were 1) a crew that works well as a team, 2) a safe working environment, and 3) increased pay and benefits. Additional considerations, in ranked order, included good equipment, support from management, dispatch call screening, effective leadership, advanced scope of practice, enhanced continuing education programs and opportunities to practice infrequently used skills.

Research Question 2: “What are the important things that an employee requires for job satisfaction as it relates to EMS?”

In the original survey instrument, the responses to question two yielded a list of 17 factors that the employees felt were important in leading to job satisfaction as it relates to providing EMS care. Those factors can be found in Appendix C on the Employee Ballot. When asked to identify the three most important factors from the list

developed, the results were ranked in priority order. The three most important factors were 1) working well as a well coordinated team, 2) competitive wages and benefits, and 3) satisfied patients and public support. Additional considerations, in ranked order, included feeling like the employee made a difference, management interest in the employees, opportunities to improve or practice skills, recognition of efforts, patient follow up information, good flow of accurate and timely information and feedback on job performance.

Research Question 3: “How well is the EMS leadership doing at providing an environment to promote enhance job satisfaction?”

In Phase III of the project, the employees completed an evaluation form (Appendix E) that yielded the greatest amount of information. The results of this evaluation can be found in Appendix F. The results encompassed 18 questions and rated the Division of a scale of 1-5. The overall average for the entire instrument was 2.96. This reflected a rating of average or “ok.” Within each section, the ratings varied. In the teamwork section (5 questions), the average rating was 3.06. In the management/leadership section (8 questions), the average rating was 2.73. Within the equipment and training section (5 questions), the average rating was 3.22.

DISCUSSION

Oftentimes in government, we focus on our external customers and ignore our internal customers (employees) who are the people delivering our service to the customers.

Twenty-five years ago, as a truck driver for a large battery manufacturing company, this

author experienced how much attention the company paid to its delivery drivers. The drivers were paid well and provided professional uniforms to wear. At that time, a manager revealed that the delivery driver was the last point of contact the company had with its customer. If the drivers were satisfied with their job conditions, they would be more likely to be pleasant with the customer. This led to the last point of contact with the customer being enjoyable. It became apparent at an early age that if employees are satisfied and have the things necessary to do their job well, then ultimately, the customer would have a very positive experience.

Hunt (1992) identified four areas to question in terms of quality enhancements. One of those areas, climate, identifies people's perceptions about their organization or work unit. This study was extensive in supporting this concept, as it largely reflects the perceptions of the workforce in the area of EMS. In the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria (1999), one of the quality assessments focuses on whether or not an organization actually asks employees how they feel. The various survey instruments coincide with this quality indicator. What is important to do next is take the results of these instruments and convert them into a work plan that is shared with the employees.

While the literature defines some subtleties in the differences between job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction (Pace and Faules), the results didn't seem to support either one of those concepts. One reason may be that the survey instruments were not sufficiently detailed to elicit such information. Of interest to note in the evaluation results (Appendix F) was the amount of information, that when charted, revealed a trend of job satisfaction in the form of bell curves. In other words, of the survey population,

most of the respondents were neutral in their satisfaction while, to varying degrees, a smaller number of people were either more or less satisfied. This may support several management theorems that in most organizations, the bulk of the employees are generally satisfied. On either side of the bell curve, employees represented a small percentage of people who are highly motivated or satisfied, while a similar small percentage on the other side are highly unmotivated or dissatisfied. Another variable that was unmeasured and speculative is the fact that the organization has been undergoing a period of tremendous change in the past few years with the advent of a new paramedic program in 1997.

In the areas of teamwork, the information seemed to support various points of view. While most people felt good that the EMS Division helped to support a well coordinated team, there was slightly less belief in the effectiveness of the “partners” training program which teaches EMTs how to work alongside paramedics. Additionally, an anecdotal belief of problems between the firefighters and the private ambulance company was supported by the fact that 77% of the respondents believed that the integration of the private ambulance into the firefighting team was average, poor or very poor. Conversely, 82% of the respondents were very satisfied with their current work assignments. This may be due largely in fact due to the station bidding policy that allows firefighters to select their station assignments based on seniority. Lastly, the survey supported an average rating on the manner in which our educational programs support teamwork.

The section on management and leadership provided the greatest opportunity for evaluating areas where improvements could be made. Generally speaking, the employees felt that when it came to being fair or building morale, the Division was average. In other words, we weren't overly fair, but we weren't overly unfair. It's unknown if the morale question is directly linked to the EMS Division specifically or if it's reflective of the Fire District's overall morale picture. One area of weakness was in providing feedback on job performance. There are two possible approaches to this data. First, the EMS Division is staffed with 2.5 full time employees. The District runs over 35,000 medicals per year in an area in excess of 300 square miles. This Division is simply not sufficiently staffed to provide adequate performance feedback. Secondly, the District is finalizing the installation of an electronic patient care reporting system that, when completed, will provide electronic statistical information on individual and system performance measures on EMS calls. Once completed, this feedback data rating should improve. Similar to the fact that we don't provide adequate feedback on job performance is the poor response to the question on the effectiveness of communication. This may also be due to both technological and staffing barriers. Several factors must still be evaluated before a determination can be reached regarding how to overcome the perceived communications deficiencies. On a positive note, it was revealed that when employees communicate with the EMS Division on issues requiring follow up to questions or concerns, the Division received better marks in this area. Other areas that received an overall average rating were listening to ideas, recognition of efforts, and respect or value as a professional.

In the last section on equipment and training, the Division scored its highest marks. Overall, when it came to getting the necessary tools and equipment to provide quality EMS care, the Division's efforts were rated as good. Similarly, the survey population felt that both the amount and effectiveness of continuing education programs was average to good. One area to be addressed is a concern that employees are not getting enough opportunities to practice their skills. This will require the District to search for new methods to address skills degradation issues. Lastly, on a positive note, the workforce was pleased with information received on new policies and procedures.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the research findings and discussion, it is prudent to address the recommendations from both a process and product point of view. While the evaluation tool yields specific areas of concern and areas for improvement, a general process approach must first be defined. There are four main recommendations on process. First, as with any type of in-depth surveys, the results should be shared with the participants. Therefore, it is recommended that copies of the results of the evaluation tool, along with the developed action plan, be made available at each fire station. Secondly, an action plan that addresses the areas of low scoring should be developed with recommendations for how the Fire District intends to improve overall. This action plan should be developed in coordination with the Quality Leadership Council. Once the action plan is developed, a strict implementation guide with timetables for completion needs to be completed. Lastly, after the suggested improvement tools are

instituted, the employee population should be resurveyed in two years to determine if any of the suggested improvements were valid.

On a specific note, there are several areas for improvement in each of the three main evaluation categories of teamwork, leadership, and equipment. Regarding teamwork, it is recommended that the current “partners” training curriculum be reevaluated to determine where improvements can be made in facilitating better teamwork. Additionally, increasing joint training between the fire service and the private ambulance would be beneficial in improving that specific rating.

In the area of management and leadership, weakness in communications and feedback seemed prevalent. There are several suggestions that should lead to improvements in this area. On the technological side, expanding the Fire District e-mail system to include employees in the fire station would be a valuable tool. Additionally, the Fire District needs to accelerate the implementation of the electronic patient care reporting program to improve feed back on job performance. Currently, the EMS staff is housed at three different worksites. Consolidation of the entire EMS staff into one work location would facilitate better management and communication. By locating this site at the Fire District Training Center, the EMS leadership will enjoy greater access to line personnel.

On a more global perspective, it is recommended that the EMS Division develop some focus groups to further analyze and address all areas where poor or very poor evaluations were received. Using this tool, the EMS Division should institute some type

of a reward or recognition program that provides constant feedback and recognition not only for exceptional work, but also for diligent, consistent, and steadfast work.

In the area of training and equipment, it is recommended that the EMS Division consider restructuring the current EMS training delivery model. One such recommendation is to institute a brief 9 minutes per day training concept. This way, training can occur on a daily basis in every fire station. This tool can also be used to improve communications within the workforce.

As was stated earlier, the information gleaned from these results should be used to establish a baseline for future evaluations of the performance of the EMS Division leadership. Through the use of all the aforementioned tools and ideas, employee satisfaction and the job performance can be improved within the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District.

REFERENCES

- Bavendam Research Incorporated. (2000). *Special Reports—Effective Management Through Measurement*, 6, Mercer Island, WA.
- Cannie, Joan Koob. (1991). *Keeping Customers for Life*, New York, New York: American Management Association.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency, United States Fire Administration. (July 1998). *Strategies for Marketing Your Fire Department Today and Beyond* (FA-182). United States Fire Administration Publication Center: Author.
- Gallagher, Carol. (2001). *Contra Costa County Fire Protection District EMS Quality Improvement Program*, Pleasant Hill, CA: Contra Costa County Fire Protection District.
- Greenburg. (1997 Jan/March), Quality Indicators for Out of Hospital Emergency Medical Services: The Paramedic's Perspective. *Prehospital Emergency Care*, 1/1, pp. 23-27.
- Hitt, Michael, Middlemist, R. Dennis, Mathis, Robert. (1989). *Management Concepts and Effective Practice* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: West Publishing Co.
- Hunt, V. Daniel. (1992). *Quality in America, How to Implement A Competitive Quality Program*. Homewood, Illinois: Business One Irwin.
- Juran, J.M. (1989). *Juran on Leadership for Quality, An Executive Handbook*, New York, New York: The Free Press.
- Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program. (1999). *Criteria for Performance Excellence*, Gaithersburg, Md. National Institute of Standards and Technology.
- Pace, Wayne and Faules, Don. (1994). *Organizational Communication* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.